

FILED

2012 NOV 14 AM 9:20

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES  
JNPUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 WEDGEWOOD COMMUNITY FUND II,  
11 LLC,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 vs.  
14 ALBA C. RUANO, et al.,  
15 Defendants.

CASE NO. CV 12-08432 UA (SS)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING  
IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

16  
17 The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily  
18 because Defendant removed it improperly.

19  
20 On October 1, 2012, Defendant, having been sued in what appears to be a routine  
21 unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of Removal of that  
22 action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The  
23 Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not  
24 properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court  
25 issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

26  
27 Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first  
28 place, in that Defendants do not competently allege facts supplying either diversity or

1 federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see  
2 Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S.Ct. 2611, 162  
3 L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in  
4 controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C.  
5 §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the  
6 amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

7  
8 Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See  
9 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

10  
11 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the  
12 Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, North District, Michael D. Antonovich  
13 Antelope Valley Courthouse, 42011 4th St. West, Lancaster, CA 93534, for lack of  
14 subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a  
15 certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this  
16 Order on the parties.

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: 11/14/12

20  
21 GEORGE H. KING  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE